

State Historic Preservation Review Board Meeting Minutes

January 26, 2018

the Auditorium at the Montana Historical Society, Helena, Montana

January 26, 2019

Review Board (Board) Members Present: Zane Fulbright, Dr. Riley Auge (Chair), Milo McLeod, Carol Bronson, Dr. Tim Urbaniak, Debra Hronek, Marcella Walter

State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Staff: Dr. Mark Baumler, John Boughton, Kate Hampton, (Intermittent: Brad Hanson, Michelle Phair, Peter Brown)

Guests: Bruce Whittenberg, Janene Caywood, Mary Williams, Miki Wilde, Bill Bronson, Jessie Nunn, Chere Jiusto, Becki Miller, Candi Zion, Heather McMilin, Matt Werle, Sara Scott, Ron Nemetz, Heather Murray, Raymond Read

Call to Order-1:00 p.m.: Dr. Auge called the meeting to order and read the State Historic Preservation Review Board mission statement.

Election of Board Chair for 2018: Dr. Auge called for nominations. Dr. Tim Urbaniak and Dr. Riley Auge were nominated by Zane Fulbright and Dr. Tim Urbaniak respectively. Dr. Auge was selected to serve a second year as Chair by simple majority vote (5-2).

Welcome/Introductions-1:15 p.m.: Dr. Auge requested that the Board, SHPO personnel, and guests introduce themselves. Director of the Montana Historical Society, Bruce Whittenberg, welcomed the Board members, made brief comments about the state of the Montana Historical Society and thanked the Board for their time and effort.

SHPO Preservation News-1:18 p.m.: John Boughton briefed the Board about several subjects including:

- **Local Preservation/Certified Local Government (CLG):** Kate Hampton and Brad Hanson received and approved semi-annual reports from all 16 of the Montana CLGs. To date, SHPO has reimbursed almost \$43, 000 in requested CLG allowable expenses (out of \$80,200.00 total awarded). CLGs in turn have reported just over \$189,000 in cash and in-kind match, which is extremely important to fulfill a large part of SHPO's match necessary for federal funds received through the National Park Service (Historic Preservation Fund).

The Lewistown historic preservation officer position remains open.

- **Montana Preservation Plan:** A draft of the updated 5-year state historic preservation plan (*Preservation Montana 2018-2022*) was sent to the National Park Service for review in November 2017 and approved in January 2018. The NPS will send comments and an official approval to SHPO sometime in the 30 days. When the final is completed it will be posted on the SHPO website and announcement made.
- **SHPO FFY2017 EOY National Park Service Report and Summary of Activities:** SHPO completed its end-of-year reporting to the National Park Service on the allowable use and distribution of 2016 and 2017 Historic Preservation Funds for the federal fiscal year 2017 (October 1, 2016 - September 30, 2017). SHPO Grants Manager Brad Hansen prepared and submitted the necessary financial reports to NPS. A public annual narrative summary report of SHPO activities in federal FY2017 is posted on the SHPO website (<http://mhs.mt.gov/Portals/11/shpo/docs/SHPO2017AROA.pdf>).

- **SHPO Activity Priorities in 2018:** on December 5, 2017, SHPO and other MHS programs participated in a day of strategic planning and updating of critical issues. SHPO identified three major priorities for the program over the coming year:
 - refresh the SHPO website to make it more effective in addressing user inquiries;
 - develop and market more historic preservation success stories in Montana as examples of the benefits of historic preservation; and
 - strategize with the Director and MHS Administration in making a more convincing case for state funding match of the State Historic Preservation program.
- **Archaeology Day:** On October 5, 2017, a total of 518 kids (5 schools/21 classes) from the Helena area attended Archaeology Day, held on the Montana Historical Society and Capitol grounds. Archaeology Day is co-organized by SHPO and the MHS Outreach & Interpretation Program. SHPO staff participation included Dr. Stan Wilmoth, Brad Hansen, Jessica Bush, Michelle Phair, Damon Murdo, Kate Hampton, and John Boughton. A number of other staff from the Montana Historical Society also assisted throughout the day.
- **Cemetery Preservation Workshop:** A cemetery preservation workshop organized by the Montana History Foundation is scheduled for June 21-23 at the Radisson Colonial in Helena. Dr. Tim Urbaniak and Dr. Riley Auge of the Board and Dr. Ellen Baumler of the Montana Historical Society are involved as presenters in the workshop. Funding for the workshop is being provided by a grant from the National Park Service.
- **Properties Listed in the National Register Since May 2017**
 - Western Clay Manufacturing Company (Helena, National level of significance)
 - Moose Lake Camp Historic District (Granite County)
 - Draft Horse Barn (Fergus County Fairgrounds)
 - DeSmet* (Boat) (Lake McDonald, Glacier National Park)
 - Little Chief* (Boat) (Two Medicine Lake, Glacier National Park)
 - Grant-Marshall Lime Kiln Historic District (Jefferson County)
 - L-4 Fire Lookouts in the USFS Northern Region (Region 1) 1932-1967
 - MPSBoulder Point Lookout (Missoula County, Lolo National Forest)
 - West Fork Butte Lookout (Missoula County, Lolo National Forest)
 - Double Arrow Lookout (Missoula County, Lolo National Forest)
- **Potential Upcoming Nominations**
 - Jefferson Canyon Highway (Jefferson County)
 - Big Chief* (Boat) (Glacier National Park)
 - A.M.E Shaffer Chapel
 - Cougar Peak Lookout (Sanders County, Lolo National Forest)

Consideration of National Register nominations-1:30 p.m.

1) Fort Assinniboine (Boundary Increase and Additional Documentation)

Historian Candi Zion, a major contributor to the nomination, presented the nomination. The property was previously listed in the National Register at a local and state level of significance. The present nomination expands the boundary of the property, extends the period of significance to 1967, raises the level of significance for the period 1879 to 1903 to national significance under Criterion A for the military resources, acknowledges the archaeological importance of the

property as significant under Criterion D at a local, state, and national level for the military resources, and includes resources associated with the Northern Agricultural Research Center (NARC) of Montana State University at the state level of significance.

Questions and Comments from the Review Board:

- Add a map showing the previous National Register boundary.
- Are photos included of all the foundations? [representative photographs of some of the foundations appear at the end of the nomination].
- Can photographs be incorporated into the text? [yes, the new guidance for digitally-submitted nominations to the National Register state that photographs can now occur within the text of the nomination as well as on continuation pages at the end of the nomination. This is optional].
- Should “ruins” be called out individually or grouped? [either is acceptable].
- Is Criterion Consideration D necessary (pertaining to cemeteries)? [no, as the fort cemetery is nominated as part of a larger district, and is not the focus of the nomination, no special explanation is required].
- Acknowledge local historian Gary Wilson’s (deceased) past efforts and present contribution to making this boundary increase and additional documentation come to fruition.
- Should be “Rocky Boy’s Reservation”, not “Rocky Boy Reservation.” [edit as needed]
- Well written. The document does a good job of pulling the information back to the story of the fort itself.

Dr. Urbaniak moved, and Ms. Hronek seconded, that the nomination with discussed edits be forwarded to the Keeper. The Review Board unanimously concurred.

2) Lewistown Satellite Airfield Boundary Increase IV

Zane Fulbright, the author, presented the nomination. The property was presented as significant under Criterion A.

Questions and Comments from the Review Board:

- What would an example of an adverse effect be to this property? [primarily changes to the uninhabited landscape: cultivation, installation of a powerline, development, sage grouse disruption].
- Were the artifacts found on-site left in the field [some small collection initially occurred, but later investigations recorded and left the artifacts in situ].
- Who owns the property? [the BLM and two private owners, both of which were contacted at the beginning and notified of the nomination, but did not respond.].

Ms. Walter moved and Ms. Bronson seconded, that the Lewistown Satellite Airfield Boundary Increase IV nomination, with discussed edits be forwarded to the Keeper. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Mr. Fulbright abstained from voting.

Break-2:15 p.m.

Resumption of meeting-2:30 p.m.

3) Gird Point Lookout (presented under the L-4 Fire Lookouts in the USFS Northern Region (Region 1), 1932-1967 Multiple Property Document (MPD))

Medicine Point Lookout (presented under the L-4 Fire Lookouts in the USFS Northern Region (Region 1), 1932-1967 Multiple Property Document)

St. Mary Lookout (presented under the L-4 Fire Lookouts in the USFS Northern Region (Region 1), 1932-1967 Multiple Property Document)

Janene Caywood, historian, prepared and presented the nominations. The properties were presented as significant under criteria A and C, in reference to the registration requirements established under the MPD.

Questions and Comments from the Review Board:

- Do the records indicate any reason why the L-4 design continued to be constructed for so many years? [no].
- Capitalize “forest” when referring to a specific Forest.

Dr. Urbaniak moved and Ms. Walter seconded support of the Gird Point Lookout, a federal nomination, with the suggested inclusion of discussed and written edits, and that it be forwarded to the Keeper by the Forest Service. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Mr. McLeod (USFS retired/spouse of Janene Caywood) recused himself from voting.

Mr. Fulbright moved and Ms. Walter seconded support of the Medicine Point Lookout, a federal nomination, with the suggested inclusion of discussed and written edits, and that it be forwarded to the Keeper by the Forest Service. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Mr. McLeod (USFS retired/spouse of Janene Caywood) recused himself from voting.

Mr. Fulbright moved and Ms. Hronek seconded support of St. Mary Lookout, a federal nomination, with the suggested inclusion of the edits, and that it be forwarded to the Keeper by the Forest Service. The Review Board unanimously concurred. Mr. McLeod (USFS retired/spouse of Janene Caywood) recused himself from voting.

4) Livingston Memorial Hospital

Jessie Nunn, historian and author, presented the nomination, which is eligible for listing under Criteria A.

Questions and Comments from the Review Board:

- Why isn't the building also eligible under Criterion C? [too many changes from its original appearance].
- Could the outbuildings be considered eligible? [no, they weren't constructed until around 1973].
- This nomination is tied to a very important adaptive re-use project for low-income housing. A commendable project.
- Will the ER wing of the hospital be removed in the future? [no].
- Can the original entry be restored? [not entirely; but significant architectural elements may be re-introduced]
- Change the date (typo) for the end period of significance on page 24 from 2015 to 1967.
- Add a photograph of the entry as it exists today.
- Add the historic photos of the hospital shown during the power point.

Ms. Bronson moved and Mr. Fulbright seconded that the nomination, with discussed edits, be forwarded to the Keeper. The Review Board unanimously concurred.

5) Lewis and Clark Caverns Historic District

Chere Jiusto, historian, prepared and presented the nomination. The property was presented as significant under criteria A and C.

Questions and Comments from the Review Board:

- Does the boundary include all the subsurface caves? [unsure, the boundary mostly follows the present boundary of Lewis and Clark Caverns State Park, excluding the newer campground and visitor station at the entry. It can be adjusted to be sure to include all of the subterranean caverns, a significant contributing resource, if necessary].
- Should the caverns be referred to in the singular or plural?
- Add the historic photos shown in the power point to the nomination.
- Why not include the camping area to the south? [not historic, therefore noncontributing to the district].
- Please discuss the caverns as bat habitat and the bat's importance to the larger ecosystem.
- Include a photo of the entrance gate that marks the boundary of the historic district.
- Comment: this is a property that most people thought would already be listed in the National Register. Montana State Parks is to be commended for bringing this nomination forward.

Ms. Bronson moved and Dr. Urbaniak seconded that the nomination, with discussed edits, be forwarded to the Keeper. The Review Board unanimously concurred.

Public Comment-3:40 p.m.: Dr. Auge called for public comment. Ms. Jiusto said a few words regarding the upcoming Montana Preservation Roadshow in June 2018 to be held in the Flathead/Glacier region around Columbia Falls.

New Business-3:45 p.m.: Dr. Auge called for approval of the September 2017 minutes. Ms. Walter moved and Mr. Fulbright seconded to approve the minutes. The Board unanimously concurred.

May 2018 Review Board Meeting. The Board voted to hold the next Board meeting in Helena on May 1 and 2 (Tuesday and Wednesday).

2018 biennial State Heritage Property Stewardship Reporting Discussion: An hour-long discussion began with examining the possibility of changing the report to the legislature from the pamphlet-based informational brochure format used the last three reporting cycles to a simpler and shorter "white paper" summary document and engaging narrated Power Point-type presentation that focuses on illustrating major findings and recommendations. The Power-point would be used not only in presentation to the Legislature but also posted on the web afterwards,

Another option discussed continuing with the pamphlet but instead of printing it, just posting it online. While an option, the preparation of both reporting mediums (publication quality pamphlet and Power Point presentation) would require much more time, expertise and expense than the Board has. If a simpler white paper approach was followed, it could reference the previous three pamphlet reports (2012, 2014, 2016) as important baseline information.

Discussion also occurred whether it is advantageous or necessary to also prepare individual letters to agencies with feedback about their individual reports, as has occurred the last three reporting cycles. This has taken considerable time and required a special meeting of a Board committee with little or no response or obvious action taken by agencies as a result of these Board letters. It was proposed that meeting face-to-face with agencies – especially those that have a difficult time with heritage stewardship - might prove more effective at this point than additional comment letters. In addition, the agencies will be receiving the summary report and Power Point presentation to the Legislature.

The Board resolved that all Board members will review the new 2018 reports that are due by February 6 from the state agencies and will be posted on the SHPO website: <http://mhs.mt.gov/Shpo/ReviewComp/StateHeritageProperties>. These agency reports will be discussed at the extended May meeting in the context of defining the primary information, findings and/or recommendations to be highlighted in a very focused 2018 Board-SHPO summary document (report) with enhanced presentation (Power Point). Prior to the May 2018 Board meeting, special working groups may be designated by the Chair to focus the discussion on the different aspects of this work to be accomplished at the May meeting.

Adjourn-5:00 p.m. Mr. Fulbright moved for adjournment of the meeting. The move was seconded by Dr. Urbaniak. The Review Board unanimously concurred.